

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1-21 are amended herein. Claims 22-26 are added herein. Support for the amendments to the claims, and for the new claims, may be found in the claims as originally filed, in Fig. 7, and at page 17, lines 8-25, continuing at page 18, lines 1-25, and continuing further at page 19, lines 1-5 of the specification. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0170782 to Millikan et al. (hereinafter "Millikan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,582 to Hayward et al. (hereinafter "Hayward"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The third clause of claim 1 recites:

A deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash.

Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "a deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as recited in claim 1. Millikan, rather, *rejects* bills that fail a visual check, instead of "adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0046]:

The currency and coin acceptor and change assembly 69 has a bill reader 72 for inputting different denominations of currency, verifying that a bill is authentic, rejecting bills that fail a visual check, and causing the respective self-checkout station 1 to credit a bill's denomination to a customer's tender amount.

Since Millikan rejects bills that fail a visual check, Millikan has no "deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been

deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash,” as recited in claim 1.

Millikan, moreover, *returns* bills or coins that are rejected, instead of “adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0047]:

Each of the bill reader 72 and the coin input mechanism 73 has a mechanism (not shown) for returning bills or coins that are rejected, and for returning a change amount to the customer for money tendered in excess of the order total amount.

Since Millikan returns bills or coins that are rejected, Millikan has no “deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Millikan, rejected coins or coins returned to a customer as change are *output* to the change receptacle 74, instead of “adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in paragraph [0047]:

The bill reader 72 returns rejected currency to the customer 2. Rejected coins or coins returned to a customer as change are output to the change receptacle 74.

Since, in Millikan, rejected coins or coins returned to a customer as change are output to the change receptacle 74, Millikan has no “deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash,” as recited in claim 1.

In Hayward, for its part, the cashier 20 is positioned on the cashier side 16 of the automated checkout station 10 to aid the customer 22 in conducting a transaction. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 46-52:

The electronic payment system 36 thus allows the customer 22 to complete a cash or check transaction completely unaided by the cashier 20 and in a minimum amount of time. However, the cashier 20 may be positioned on the cashier side 16 of the automated checkout station 10 to aid the customer 22 in conducting a transaction.

Since, in Hayward, the cashier 20 is positioned on the cashier side 16 of the automated checkout station 10 to aid the customer 22 in conducting a transaction, Hayward has no "deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as recited in claim 1.

Finally, in Hayward, the cashier 20 may also accept payment, as opposed to using the electronic payment system 36. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 52-57:

The cashier 20 may also accept payment, as opposed to using the electronic payment system 36. Accordingly, the station 10 includes a cash drawer 46 for storing money and coupons. The cash drawer 46 is preferably located on the cashier side 16 of the automated checkout station 10.

Since, in Hayward, the cashier 20 may also accept payment, as opposed to using the electronic payment system 36, Hayward has no "deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Millikan and Hayward were combined as proposed in the Office Action, claim 1 would not result. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 3, 4, and 5 depend from claim 1 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 6, 8, 9, and 10:

The third clause of claim 6 recites:

A deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of accepted cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates a total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash.

Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "a deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of accepted cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates a total amount of deposited cash that has been

deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 6 is thus also submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 8, 9, and 10 depend from claim 6 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 8, 9, and 10 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 9, and 10 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11, 13, 14, and 15:

The fourth clause of claim 11 recites:

Calculating total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash.

Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "calculating total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 11 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 13, 14, and 15 depend from claim 11 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 13, 14, and 15 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 14, and 15 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16, 18, and 19:

The fourth clause of claim 16 recites:

Calculating a total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash.

Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "calculating a total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 16 is thus also submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim number one. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 16 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 18 and 19 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 19 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 20 and 21:

The fourth clause of claim 20 recites:

Calculating total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash.

Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "calculating total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 20 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 advance further distinguishing elements. Claim 21 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17:

Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millikan and Hayward in view of "Official Notice." The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 depend from claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, respectively, and add further distinguishing elements. Neither Millikan nor Hayward teach, disclose, or suggest "a deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. "Official Notice" does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of neither Millikan nor Hayward with respect to any of claims 2, 7, 12, or 17. Thus, even if Millikan, Hayward, and "Official Notice" were combined as proposed in the Office Action, claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 would not result. Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Application Serial No. 10/775,142
Amendment filed June 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed December 27, 2007

New Claims 22-26:

Claims 22-26 depend from claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 20, respectively, and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 22-26 are thus believed to be allowable.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-26 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-26 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 25, 2008

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501